

REMARKS

Summary of Examiner Interview

An Examiner interview was held on July 11, 2011. During the interview, Applicants and Examiner discussed the merits of claim 10. Applicants submitted that claim 10 is in condition for allowance because Paik does not teach determining the location of articles at the beginning of a sentence, instead being location agnostic when identifying. Examiner submitted that may need to be placed on the following element of claim 10: “each feature term may have a modifier describing the feature term, and the identifying includes for each sentence having a verb phrase where the verb phrase has no matching entry in the opinion dictionary, assigning an opinion polarity of the modifier of the feature term to the feature term, the opinion polarity of the modifier being defined in the opinion dictionary”. However, Examiner stated that further thought is required to further determine the merits of claim 10 as written.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 10, 12, and 14-17 were previously pending. As per the current response, no claims have been amended. Applicants respectfully request review of claims 10, 12, and 14-17, and submit that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

35 USC 103(a)

Claims 10, 12, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boguraev et al., US Patent No. 6,185,592 (hereinafter “Boguraev”), in view of Chase, US Patent No. 6,332,143 (hereinafter “Chase”), and further in view of Paik et al., US Patent No. 6,076,088 (hereinafter “Paik”).

In reference to independent claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not describe all of the features of the claim. More specifically, Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not at least describe

“determining a definite article [being] located at the beginning of a sentence” {Emphasis Added}.

The Office Action points to Column 10, lines 25-45, of Paik as describing an “end-of-sentence detection module.” Applicants respectfully submit, though, that while Paik may describe determining an end of a sentence, Paik does not describe determining the location of a definite article within a sentence. Identifying definite articles in Paik is location agnostic in relation to its position in the sentence.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not at least describe “...each feature term may have a modifier describing the feature term, and the identifying includes for each sentence having a verb phrase where the verb phrase has no matching entry in the opinion dictionary, assigning an opinion polarity of the modifier of the feature term to the feature term, the opinion polarity of the modifier being defined in the opinion dictionary...” {emphasis added}. Chase does not describe or suggest each and every sentence being analyzed having a verb phrase with no matching entry in the opinion dictionary.

As a result, since Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not describe all of the features of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Regarding claims 12 and 14-17, since claims 12 and 14-17 depend from independent claim 10 and independent claim 10 is in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 14-17 are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If Examiner wishes to discuss any portion of the docket or prosecution, or if a phone call would expedite prosecution of the application, Examiner is invited to telephone Brian Lambert at 408-927-3364.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Brian Lambert/

Brian Lambert
Date: July 11, 2011
Reg. No. 60,708
IBM Almaden Research Center
650 Harry Road
C45A/J2B
San Jose, CA 95120
Phone Number: 408-927-3364
Facsimile Number: 408-927-3375